

REMARKS

Claims 1-46, 49, 50, and 52-55 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the telephone interview with Applicants' representative on June 18, 2007. During the interview, independent Claim 46 was discussed with the Examiner as was the cited art. No agreement was reached as to the allowability of any of the rejected claims.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Guicheon et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,569,092). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note that Guichon et al. is directed to a tagging system that identifies individual animals and tracks the movement of an individual animal in a pen. See Guichon et al. abstract. Guichon et al. is not directed to providing a farm house substantially enclosing a volume, positioning an integrator separate from a farm house, or determining a condition to achieve an optimal quality and yield of a product from a farm house.

Contrary to Guichon et al., amended Claim 46 recites, "positioning the integrator separate from the farmhouse; providing a farm house substantially enclosing a volume; determining a condition to achieve an optimal quality and yield of a product from the

farm house with the integrator; monitoring a parameter related to the product at the farm house". Guichon et al. does not disclose or render apparent providing a farm house. Guichon et al. is directed to a feedlot 10 and open pens 12. See Guichon et al. Fig. 1 and col. 4, Ins. 36-40. Moreover, Guichon et al. discloses monitoring movement of animals to make other determinations. See. Guichon et al. col. 12, Ins. 16-29. Guichon et al. does not disclose monitoring a condition of an item. Thus, Guichon et al. actually teaches away from "monitoring a parameter related to the product at the farm house" as recited in Claim 46.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claim 55 is supported throughout the specification and drawings a filed, such as paragraph 36. Therefore, Claim 55 does not include any new subject matter. Also, as discussed with the Examiner during the interview, Applicants submit that the cited art does not teach or render apparent each of the elements of Claim 55.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicates that claims 1-45, 49, 50, and 52-54 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of these claims as allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 18, 2007

By: Richard W. Warner
Richard W. Warner
Reg. No. 38,043

Michael L. Taylor
Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWW/MLT/srh